

REMARKS

Applicant has carefully reviewed and considered the Examiner's Office Action dated August 9, 2005. Reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following comments.

Applicant thanks Examiner Weaver for the courtesies extended to his representative during the telephonic interview held on November 2, 2005. During that interview, proposed specification and drawings changes and proposed claimed changes were discussed. In particular, the Examiner indicated that the specification and drawing changes overcame the drawing objection and the 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph rejection. With respect to the proposed claims, the Examiner indicated that the amendments to claims 1 and 11 would overcome the applied prior art rejection because Leigner does not disclose opposing panels with two different radii of curvature as one set of opposing panels is flat and does not have a radius of curvature.

*Interview
record OK
Bv*

By this Amendment, the specification is amended, as proposed in the telephonic interview to provide a brief description of new Figure 6 showing a cross-section of body section 8 and to revise paragraphs [00021] and [00022] to refer to midpoint 8m and the vertical side panel 8b; claims 1, 3, 9-11, 13-15 and 17 are amended as discussed in the November 2, 2005 telephonic interview; claim 2 is canceled; new claims 19-20 are added; Figures 1 and 3 are amended and new Figure 6 is presented as proposed and discussed during the telephonic interview. Accordingly, claims 1 and 3-20 are pending in the present application.

The drawings were objected to because the R1 and R2 were not identified in the drawings, and the recessed vertical posts, the two opposing relatively smooth vertical